

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending prior to entering this amendment.

The examiner rejects claims 1, 5, 8, 12, 15, 19, 22, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent 6,457,125, hereinafter referred to as Matthews) in view of Fletcher et al. (U.S. 6,009,274, hereinafter referred to as Fletcher), and further in view of Richman et al. (U.S. 5,655,148, hereinafter referred to as Richman).

The examiner rejects claims 2-4, 9-11, 16-18, and 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in view of Fletcher, Richman, and further in view of Collins (U.S. Patent No. 5,671,355, hereinafter referred to as Collins).

The examiner rejects claims 6-7, 13-14, and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Matthews in view of Fletcher, and further in view of Richman.

Claims 1-2, 4, 6-9, 11, 13-16, 18, 20-23, and 25 are amended. Claims 3, 10, 17, and 24 are canceled. The features recited in claims 3, 10, 17, and 24 have been incorporated in claims 2, 9, 16, and 23, respectively. No new matter is added. Claims 1-2, 4-9, 11-16, 18-23, and 25-26 remain in the case for consideration. Reconsideration is requested. The rejections are traversed.

Claim Rejections Under §103

Claims 1, 5, 8, 12, 15, 19, 22, and 26 stand rejected as obvious over Matthews, Fletcher, and Richman. The applicant traverses the rejections for the reasons that follow.

Claim 1 recites “disposing a CPU and a main memory of the network communication device on the removable card, such that the CPU and the main memory of the network communications device are coupled with the network communications device via the removable card.” Claims 8, 15, and 22 recite similar features as claim 1. *See* Specification, page 10, lines 4-17.

Richman does not teach disposing a CPU and a main memory on the removable card. Richman teaches device installation or removal from the computer, or the insertion or the removal of a computer into or from a docking station. *See* col. 7, lines 29-37. Specifically, Richman’s device may include peripheral devices or adaptor boards for a computer. *See* col. 3, lines 1-2. That is, Richman teaches removal of peripheral cards, such as peripheral devices, adaptor boards for a computer, docking stations, or as the Examiner has suggested in the Office Action “audio/video cards and network cards”. Richman does not teach removal of the CPU and main memory. None of the other references cited by the Examiner teaches removal of the CPU and main memory from the device.

Removal of peripheral cards is not the same as removal of the core system, i.e., the CPU and main memory, from a device. It is well-known to one ordinary skilled in the art, that the CPU has an operating system that controls the operation of the entire system, while a peripheral card does not have an operating system. Placing the CPU and main memory on a removable card not only provides the ability to upgrade the hardware configuration for a network device, but also extends the usable life of a printed circuit board of the network device without having to send back to factory for service. For example, when a new generation CPU becomes available, the removable card is replaced with one that can physically interface with the new CPU. In the past, this was not possible since the physically interface was attached to the mother board. If a new CPU has a different pin-out from the preceding generation, it could not be used in the network device unless the entire motherboard was replaced. *See Specification, page 10, lines 10-17.*

Claim 1 also recites “storing a default operating system version and a default hardware configuration of a networked communications device in a first memory unit on said networked communications device... receiving an updated operating system version and an updated hardware configuration for said networked communications device...into a second memory unit of said networked communications device.” Claims 8, 15, and 22 recite similar features as claim 1. *See Specification, page 11, lines 15-23.*

Claim 1 recites two memory units to provide redundancy for the network communications device. One memory unit holds a default version of the operating system and hardware configuration while the other receives the most recent version. Such arrangement ensures that there is always one good copy of the hardware configuration and operating system version in the network communication device so that the network communications device will not be disable if, for example, there is power failure during the download of a new operating system version and hardware configuration. *See Specification, Page 16, lines 12-19.* In contrast, none of the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, disclose a redundancy arrangement as claimed. Claims 1, 5, 8, 12, 15, 19, 22, and 26 are allowable.

Claims 2-4, 9-11, 16-18, and 23-25 stand rejected as obvious over Matthews in view of Fletcher, Richman, and further in view of Collins. Claims 6-7, 13-14, and 20-21 stand rejected as obvious over Matthews in view of Fletcher, and further in view of Richman. The rejections are traversed for the reasons given above for the patentability of claims 1, 8, 15, and 22.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants believe the application should be in condition for allowance. If any questions remain, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

20575
Customer No.

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Julie L. Reed

Julie L. Reed
Reg. No. 35,349

210 S.W. Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503) 222-3613